

CHRONO

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
Security Committee

SECOM-D-362

7 OCT 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Frederick B. Wirth
Lieutenant Colonel, USA
Alternate TCO, [REDACTED]
Defense Intelligence Agency

25X1A

FROM: [REDACTED]
Chairman

SUBJECT: Classification Query (U)

REFERENCE: [REDACTED] ES/DCI SECOM
dated 29 September 1980; same subject

I have been advised that the subject of your query is under in-house review within the Department of Defense. Any change in classification must ultimately be approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence. Pending the outcome of the review of the Department of Defense and review of recommendations, I believe it advisable to keep this information restricted. (U)

25X1A

Distribution:

Orig Addressee w/o ref
Copy 1- [REDACTED] Series B Cy 1 of 4
OGC/CIA [REDACTED]
Copy 2- [REDACTED] - Series B Cy 2 of 4
Copy 3- [REDACTED] - Series B Cy 3 of 4

Contains TK Information. Regraded
as Unclassified When Appended [REDACTED]
Documents Are Removed

SECRET

Distribution (continued)

25X1 Copy 4 - [] - Series B Cy 4 of 4
C/DCI SECOM (filed in OS Registry)

25X1 Copy 5 - [] Copy 1 of 3
Copy 6 - SECOM Chrono w/o ref

25X1A SECOM/[]fs(2 Oct 80)
Retyped/O/C/SECOM:rjw (7 Oct 80)

7 October 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, Security Committee
VIA: Executive Secretary, Security Committee
FROM:
Security Committee Staff
SUBJECT: SECOM Seminar Agenda

25X1A

1. At the pre-SECOM meeting yesterday, you asked for suggestions concerning the agenda item, "Critical Personnel Security Issues." I therefore recommend the following change:

o Replace the topics listed under that item with a 30-minute presentation of the proposed appeals procedures by DCI/OGC, followed by continuation of the 24 September 1980 meeting, i.e., consideration of the Investigative Standards Working Group recommendations one through four. The Wednesday afternoon schedule could be re-arranged in the following way with little disruption:

1300-1600 Critical Personnel Issues

1. DCID 1/14 Appeals
2. Investigative Standards
Working Group Recommendations
one through four

1600-1730 Security in Industry

2. Rationale: No one at the meeting yesterday seemed to understand why the adjudication guidelines were on the agenda much less how to structure discussion of the topic. I see no reason to discuss them again so soon after the SECOM has unanimously agreed to Annex A. The ink is hardly dry; why take a step backward to rehash a matter that is not an issue. The SECOM could more profitably use its time to consider unresolved issues.



25X1A

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt